REMARKS

Dependent claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodner combined with Smith and Albal in further view of Suzuki. Paper No. 20060921, page 11. The examiner concedes that the combination of Bodner, Smith, and Albal fails to teach automatically intiating a search for information on a third, remotely located database. For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that *prima facie* obviousness has not been established.

For example, Suzuki merely searches locally on a notebook computer without searching a remotely located database. *See* paragraphs [0084] and [0085]. That is, Suzuki's cellular phone does not perform any search operations. Rather, if a notebook computer is in the vicinity of the cellular telephone, a caller number is transmitted to the notebook computer where the notebook computer begins the routine shown in Figure 6. *See* paragraphs [0053] through [0056] and [0065] through [0075]. *See also* paragraphs [0059] through [0061]. Each of the subdatabases searched is part of a personal information database 100 that is stored on the hard disk drive 14 of the notebook. *See* [0060]; Figure 5. Because Suzuki merely discloses searching locally on a notebook computer, Suzuki does not cure the deficiencies of the other cited references. Thus, amended independent claim 9, which incorporates the subject matter of dependent claim 10, is distinguished over the cited art.

Furthermore, in the rejection of claim 9, the examiner asserts that Bodner discloses teaching a record containing a phone number, a name, and other information. To support the rejection, the examiner cites to column 13, line 60-column 14, line 10. In the cited passage, the only information mentioned by Bodner is the *name* of the contact and the *identified phone number*. Thus, the examiner has not provided evidence that Bodner indeed discloses a record containing a telephone number, a name, and *other information*. For this additional reason, claim 9 and claims dependent thereon are distinguished over the cited references.

Under a similar analysis, amended independent claim 49 and claims dependent thereon are also distinguished over the cited references. Specifically, as Suzuki does not search remote databases, Suzuki does not disclose a user preference table stored in the memory of a portable, standalone personal use device that indicates a search path for a search initiator to initiate a search of a plurality of *external, remote* databases for information.

Independent claim 23 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodner combined with Smith in further view of Albal. Paper No. Paper No. 20060921, page 2. In the rejection, the examiner concedes that Bodner fails to teach searching at least a personal computer for information if the information is not present on a standalone, battery-powered, and transportable device, but that Smith cures this deficiency. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

For example, Smith indicates that a remote search request may be sent to a remote *network* such as the Internet or a closed network such as a corporate or private network. Smith, however, does not indicate that a personal computer, which is a single-user computer, is searched. Thus, for at least this reason, the examiner has not established *prima facie* obviousness with respect to claim 23 or claims dependent thereon.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0694US).

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: <u>December 29, 2006</u>

Rhonda L. Sheldon
Reg. No. 50,457
Trop, Pruner & Hu, P.C.
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057
Phone: (713) 468-8880
Fax (713) 468-8883

Attorneys for Intel Corporation